



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,359	12/21/2001	Anneli Attersand	10806-156	4324

24256 7590 01/27/2003

DINSMORE & SHOHL, LLP  
1900 CHEMED CENTER  
255 EAST FIFTH STREET  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

MAYES, LAURIE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,359

Applicant(s)

ATTERSAND, ANNELI

Examiner

Laurie Mayes

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 10, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid construct containing that nucleic acid and a recombinant method of using the construct where claims 7 and 10 are drawn to a process of making a polypeptide by recombinant means, classified in 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 2-3, drawn to an isolated polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claim 8, drawn to a method of identifying an agent capable of modulating a nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Claims 2 and 3 of Invention II encompasses 2 distinct proteins with different primary structure. The proteins are structurally different; therefore, the applicant must elect a specific sequence for examination. If Invention II is elected, claims 2 and 3 will be examined only in-so-far as it pertains to the elected SEQ ID NO.

Claim 1 encompasses DNAs encoding 2 different proteins. The applicant must select a specific sequence for examination.

Art Unit: 1653

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the peptide or nucleic acid that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including and claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

**This election requirement is not to be construed as a species election, as these compounds do not share a common primary structure and appear to be patentably distinct.**

Should applicant traverse on the ground that these different compounds are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the protein can be obtained by either the purification from a natural source or by chemical synthesis.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 1653

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case nucleic acids may be used as claimed in a method of making a polypeptide.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the peptides of Invention II are not used in the process of Invention III and are not products thereof.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, recognized divergent subject matter and because the searches required for each Group is not required for another, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Clare M Iery on 24 Jan 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Mayes whose telephone number is (703) 605-1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (703) 305-2923. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3014 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/029,359

Page 5

Art Unit: 1653

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1123.

*L. Mayes*  
Laurie Mayes

Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1653  
January 14, 2003

*Christopher S. F. Low*

CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600